

Message

From: McGrath, Jesse [mcgrath.jesse@epa.gov]
Sent: 3/22/2017 2:58:07 PM
To: Compher, Michael [compher.michael@epa.gov]; Hamilton, Scott [hamilton.scott@epa.gov]; Qazzaz, Bilal [qazzaz.bilal@epa.gov]
Subject: Minnesota spot check results

MPCA was the easiest to start with because of how they submitted their check results.

Are routine data invalidated when QC checks are marked as invalid?

No routine data seem to have been invalidated because of the precision checks, even in cases where I would expect that from Rick's wording. It's possible the rows marked "QA" mean the QC equipment was faulty and that's why they decided not to keep the check. But then I don't know how they mark when they invalidated the routine data. An example where the QC check is outside 7%, is marked as "QA" in their file, and the routine data are not flagged is row 10 from their file, site 27-017-7417, date 2019-08-14, results --85.71%.

Are routine data invalidated in the hour when the QC check is run?

These sites are listed as having a check performed, but don't have an hour of data invalidated to indicate that. They have a peak at the same time as other checks, 2-am, but the peaks don't correspond to the levels listed in the file from MPCA.

27-003-1002-44201-1 20141220

27-003-1002-44201-1 20141122

Are all checks over 7% in AQS also in the state submitted file?

Yes.

This check has the Assessment Concentration and Monitor Concentrations in opposite places in the two files, though.

27-139-0505-44201-1 20140726

Do any checks from the state files explain gaps in blocks we identified?

None of the checks from MPCA's file fell in blocks we identified for them.

Jesse McGrath
US EPA Region 5
Desk Phone: 312 886-1532
Email: mcgrath.jesse@epa.gov